



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/686,937

10/16/2003

Bin Wu

KCX-692 (19490)

4594

22827 7590 10/06/2008
DORITY & MANNING, P.A.
POST OFFICE BOX 1449
GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449

EXAMINER

ARNOLD, ERNST V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/686,937	Applicant(s) WU ET AL.	
	Examiner ERNST V. ARNOLD	Art Unit 1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/7/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,9-23 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,9-23 and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/7/08 has been entered.

Claims 3, 6, 8, 24 and 31-60 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-23 and 25-30 are under examination.

Withdrawn rejections:

Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 7/7/08 are acknowledged and have been fully considered. Any rejection and/or objection not specifically addressed below is herein withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

Art Unit: 1616

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-23 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DERWENT-ACC-NO: 1992-393132; Abstracting JP 04290547 in view of Takagishi et al. J. Polym. Sci. Polym. Chem. Ed 1985, volume 23, 2875-2878 and with respect to claims 17-20 and 25, Stoddart et al. (EP 1214878A1) and, with respect to claims 9-12, Sebag et al. (US 4,275,054) and, with respect to claims 13-16 and 26-28, Connolly (US 5,120,693).

Applicant claims a method for reducing odor comprising forming a coordination complex between a transition metal and a polydentate compound and contacting the coordination complex with an odorous compound.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art

(MPEP 2141.01)

DERWENT-ACC-NO: 1992-393132 teaches the combination of various **transition metal** (Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn etc...) salts, silicate, **bentonite**, copolymer of isobutene-maleic anhydride and **polyethyleneimine** as a deodorant gel (Title and Abstract). It is the Examiner's position that PEI will complex with the metal ions in the absence of evidence to the contrary. DERWENT-ACC-NO: 1992-393132 clearly teaches that the deodorant has a high adsorbing capacity for **malodorous gases** such as hydrogen sulphide, ammonia, mercaptan, amines and aldehydes (Abstract). DERWENT-ACC-NO: 1992-393132 clearly states that the metal salts are

Art Unit: 1616

enclosed in the structure of the silicic acid gels which contain PEI which is known to complex transition metals. PEI intrinsically contains positively charged ligands. Bentonite or the silicate can serve as a carrier for the complex.

Takagishi et al. teach the binding of divalent metal ions Cu^{2+} , Co^{2+} , Ni^{2+} and Zn^{2+} by **crosslinked polyethyleneimine** (page 2875, first paragraph). Takagishi et al. teach that crosslinking produces water insoluble polymers (page 2875, paragraphs 1-5 and page 2877, paragraphs 2).

Stoddart et al. disclose methods to control undesirable odors such as ammonia that utilize certain urease inhibitor complexes formed from a divalent metal ion and a polyanionic, preferably amine based, chelating agent (Abstract). The composition can be combined with pet litter, which comprises high surface area particles such as various clays and ([0035]). The composition can be utilized in a wide variety of articles and devices such as wiping clothes, diapers (which are comprised of cellulose fibers) and paper towels where the composition is absorbed into, adsorbed onto or chemically linked or bonded to the substrate ([0039-0042]). A bis-epoxide can be used to link HEDTA to cotton ([0043] and [0056]). Thus, Stoddart et al. establish the concept of chemically linking odor control compositions to various substrates.

Sebag et al. teach deodorant compositions comprising cationic polymers such as polyethyleneimines (Column 4, lines 37-42; Column 15, Table 1, number 7 and claims 1 and 2). Sebag et al. teach crosslinking is effected with a crosslinking reagent selected from the group consisting of epihalohydrins, diepoxides, dianhydrides, unsaturated anhydride and the bis unsaturated derivatives and provide several examples using epichlorohydrin (Column 3, lines 25-30 and Column 8, Example Ia, for example).

Art Unit: 1616

Connolly et al. teach agglomerates of zeolitic molecular sieves which are bonded with particles of spherical amorphous colloidal-sized silica particles having nominal diameters in the range of 40 to 800 nanometers which are ideally suited for use in odor elimination (Abstract).

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims

(MPEP 2141.02)

1. The difference between that which is instantly claimed and that of the DERWENT Abstract is that the DERWENT Abstract does not expressly teach crosslinking the PEI or the specific crosslinking reagents resulting in a substantially water insoluble polymer complex for use in the method for reducing odor. This deficiency in the DERWENT Abstract is cured by the teachings of Takagishi et al. and Sebag et al.

2. The difference between that which is instantly claimed and that of the DERWENT Abstract is that the DERWENT Abstract does not expressly teach a method for reducing odor further comprising combining high surface area particles with said transition metal and said polydentate compound wherein said particles have an average size of less than about 100 nm and a surface area of from about 50 to about 1000 square meters per gram and have a negative zeta potential. This deficiency in the DERWENT Abstract is cured by the teachings of Connolly et al.

3. The difference between that which is instantly claimed and that of the DERWENT Abstract is that the DERWENT Abstract does not expressly teach applying the complex to a substrate comprising a nonwoven, woven or paper web; cellulosic fiber; or chemically grafting to the substrate. This deficiency in the DERWENT Abstract is cured by the teachings Stoddart et al.

Finding of prima facie obviousness

Rational and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)

1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to use crosslinked PEI and the specific crosslinking reagents resulting in a substantially water insoluble polymer complex, as suggested by Takagishi et al., for use in the method for reducing odor in the method of the DERWENT Abstract and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Takagishi et al. teach that PEI crosslinked can produce polymers of various affinities for Cu^{2+} thus allowing for tuning of the amount of complexed Cu^{2+} (page 2877, last paragraph). Sebag et al. is relied upon for teaching the various crosslinking reagents available for one of ordinary skill in the art.

2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to use the particles taught by Connelly et al. in the method of the DERWENT Abstract and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the DERWENT Abstract provides the basic concept of using high surface area particles (silicates/bentonite) with the metal salts and PEI and Connelly et al. fills in the types of particles to use. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the particles would have a negative zeta potential and meet the surface area limitation. Please note that the USPTO is not equipped with the analytical equipment to measure each and every parameter such as zeta potential and surface area of the particles. Since the particles appear to be the same as instantly claimed, then the burden is then placed on Applicant to demonstrate otherwise. Objective evidence of

Art Unit: 1616

nonobviousness, if any, must be commensurate in scope with that of the claimed subject matter.

In re Kulling, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990); In re Lindner, 173 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1972).

3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the complex of the DERWNT Abstrat to a substrate comprising a nonwoven, woven or paper web; cellulosic fiber; or chemically grafting to the substrate, as suggested by Stoddart et al., and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because substrates such as diapers come into contact with odors and Stoddart et al. teach means to control such odors by modifying the substrate.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (*In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976).

In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Response to arguments:

Applicant's arguments are moot with respect to the new rejection of record.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dowling et al. Macromolecules 1986, 19, 344-347. Dowling et al. teach the binding of sulfonated fluorophors by metal-poly(ethylenimine) complexes (title and Abstract). Dowling et al. teach the concept of binding anions to cationic transition metal-poly(ethylenimine) complexes (page 344, introduction). Any odor associated with the anions would be decreased by binding to the transition metal-poly(ethylenimine) complexes. Cu(II), ZN(II) and Ag(I) are exemplified (abstract).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ernst V. Arnold whose telephone number is 571-272-8509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:15 am-3:45 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Ernst V Arnold/
Examiner, Art Unit 1616